DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 090 JC 750 031

AUTHOR Haskew, Laurence D.
TITLE Education Professors as Intermediaries.
PUB DATE Nov 74
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Graduate Education and the Community Colleges, sponsored by the National Board on Graduate Education (Warrenton, Virginia, November 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS College Teachers; Graduate Professors; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Junior Colleges; Political Influences; *Preservice Education; *Program Development; Schools of Education

ABSTRACT

The central issue discussed in this paper is the pressing need for specialized inservice and preservice graduate training for community college instructors. It is proposed that the large majority of successful inservice and preservice staff development programs now in existence in comprehensive universities are not due to the foresight or leadership of a Graduate School of Education or Graduate Division, but in actuality are the result of the efforts of individual professors of higher education who are community college specialists. The intermediary, or broker, roles for graduate professors dedicated to serving these inservice and preservice program needs are discussed. Political guidelines for generating interest and support among graduate departments and divisions for the initiation of such programs within the political and bureaucratic framework of the university are presented. (AH)

ED 099090

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EDUCATION PROFESSORS AS INTERMEDIARIES

Laurence D. Haskew
University of Texas at Austin

The Graduate Schools of comprehensive universities should and can respond to the pressing staff development needs of community colleges. This proposition is accepted as a tenet in the presentation following. But, not without some qualms on the part of the author. The "can" portion is not particularly disturbing. On record are many past and current Graduate School performances that seem to be constructive in reducing the need specified. Such successes lend credence to an assumption that Graduate Schools in real life have some capacity to assist community colleges. However, probably ninety per cent of the successes referred to seem to stem near-exclusively from specialist Graduate professors in departments of Education or Higher Education. In other words, successes thus far seem to arise from the Graduate School ethos of neutral permissiveness toward any collects of professors bent upon doing their own things.

The "should" portion of the proposition, on the other hand, occasions considerable dis-ease. The referents for "Graduate School" seem to be (a) a university's Graduate Professors and Departments combined to act as a legislature and arbiter, and/or (b) a fairly large number of Departments, additional to Education ones, acting as entities. If that is true, a troubling specter arises immediately. It is the Jencks and Riesman thematic that all education in America is destined to be a fiefdom of the elitist Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. This specter has dis-eased me considerably during the last 24 months. With accustomed employment

JC 750 031

opportunities drying up for Ph.D graduates in English, history, foreign languages, and psychology--to name only a few--one response by those departments has been toward opening up a community college market. In September of this year, replies to a letter sent to AGS universities indicated that over 50 per cent of respondents from the departments named above had recently made, or were contemplating, formal arrangements to enter this market. This response may be a blessing for community college protagonists. But, it can be bane, made to order for the Jencks and Reisman revolution. To use an old saw, a blow between the eyes has at last got the mule's attention. Question is, what will come out of that attention?

That brings us to the subject of this paper. The author was asked to draw upon his experience in university administration and university-watching to explore intermediary, or brokerage, roles for graduate professors dedicated to serving staff development needs of community colleges. As previously indicated, such professors are preponderantly located in departments or Schools with "Education" in their titles. That fact is significant. Seldom does such a divisional title denote upper-level power in Graduate School decision making. Nascent power can and does reside in other sources, however. The chief source, in my observation, lies in the behaviors of the persons in the professorial (or administrative) positions. These will not be elaborated upon; perhaps some can be deduced from subsequent expositions. Another source lies in the potentials for quid-pro-quo bargaining. Opportunities for coalitioning and for cooperation offer another source for power. Perhaps the greatest source lies in extra-university allies. If the five sentences immediately preceding portray a transliteration of "intermediary role" into "political

role," their intent has been accomplished. This paper treats the intra-university politics of protagonism. "Politics" is chosen because it seems important to this observer that a lobby with the welfare of community college staff development at heart be at work to countervail forces primarily concerned with the welfare of graduate departments.

The staff development objects. If graduate professors and departments respond to community college staff development needs, they address three rather (but not completely) discrete products. One consists of degree (or certificate) holders who become first-time staff members in a community college, there displaying performances consonant with the dedications and ambitions of the community college. These products typically emerge directly from a period of concerted study at a university, dominantly nonexperienced in teaching or counseling or managing, but sometimes as cross-overs from preceding educational endeavors. A second product consists of already-experienced staff members in community colleges who have obtained new or added prowesses in job-performances. In common language, these are people who have been put through inservice or continuing education enterprises. A third product consists of high-level professional specialists --would-be presidents, deans, educational development officers, and so on--who have typically engaged in university study leading to (or well toward) a doctorate. These three, then, are the staff development products that community colleges need. Hence, the argument runs, Graduate Schools should do better by these products, both quantitatively and qualitatively.

The politics of protagonism differs considerably with the product in view. Yet, commonalities exist across products. Those two considerations seem to indicate an exposition organized by products, with subsequent

discussion by conference participants being relied upon for generic applications.

1. First-time Staff Members

The author ranks the availability (from Graduate Schools) and the selection (by employers) of first-time staff members as the top ingredient of effective staff development in community colleges. The Graduate School part of it is hard to bring off. Even semi-success stories are rare. The Graduate Department part of it, however, is less difficult. Semi-successful outcomes there are quite encouraging.

Education protagonists frequently recognize that the major power over programs and student partakers thereof resides with the individual department, not with the confederation listed in catalogues as The Graduate School. One protagonist got started with a friend in the Department of Accounting. Between them, the department became interested in, first, serving its own welfare by "getting better transfers from junior colleges." This interest was nurtured by contacts with community college people--deans and presidents as well as chairmen of accounting departments. Out came an option in the two-year M. B. A. degree for community college teachers. On paper, it looked good to this observer. Apparently, it is being executed well. It is getting patrons, also. Partially because the protagonist's friend is graduate advisor in the Accounting Department. Partially because the protagonist did not leave the placement of graduates to the normal Placement Service channels. For the 1960 to 1970 decade, this Education professor can be credited with seven or eight departmental programs for community college teachers, and one for counselors. Also, the often-observed crossfeed between departments is evident in volun-

tary startups during the past two years. This illustration smacks of improvisational, nonrational, piecemeal and slow problem-solving. Those adjectives, however, aptly describe the real-life change processes in most confederacies called Graduate Schools. Protagonism may be well-advised in seizing the opportunities presented thereby. The successful lobbyist usually targets on one vote at the time.

One liability almost all professors in Education carry in negotiating for professionalized preparation programs is the automatic imputation by others of empire-building motivations to them. Nearly-equal as liability is the educationists' imputation of nonqualifications to others who venture into the professionalization realm. I judge as sagacious a College of Education Dean I know. In university budget-cabinet sessions he gave warm backing to the Dean of Humanities who wanted an extra allotment to install a Center for Teaching Effectiveness to serve that school's faculty. The Center was established; not a single Education-trained person is on its present staff. But, the Center is now operating highly-acclaimed training for community college teachers-to-be as well as for those in service--due in part to close advisement with a professor of junior college education whose assistance was requested by the Dean of Humanities. The politics of protagonism often involves encouraging or helping others to attempt what one knows darn well he can do better.

Protagonism may well include efforts toward a university-wide, policy-endorsed strategy for preservice preparation of community college teachers. Many such efforts are matters of record. Only two of the common types of strategy used will be addressed here, and then only as sketches.

One places the College of Education in the lead role. That College

devises a professionalization sequence which can be placed into or added on to existing authorized graduate degrees. It seeks and gets Graduate School legislation--usually permissive to departments--to recognize the sequence as an acceptable "minor" of some type. From then on, department-by-department sales are attempted. A sale is considered as an entering wedge; eventual influencing of the "academic" portion of the degree program is envisioned. And, as it turns out, the sales amount to little so long as nobody in the student-advising echelon of a given department is a protagonist for the option. Protagonism then involves itself in finding a departmental friend and getting him or her into the advisement hierarchy. One variation upon this strategy puts the College of Education, at outset, in the position of assembling non-Education department representatives to "explore" the community college opportunity and work up some universalized program pattern. This typically emanates as a new degree program to be carried through the Graduate School and the up-above approval machinery. If approved, the sales job still remains. Successful employment of Education-led strategy calls for about every type of political processing known. It has succeeded in some instances in establishing a catalogued, Graduate School-endorsed arrangement for purposive preparation for community college personnel. Its success in securing exploitation of the frameworks established is not encouraging. The breakdown seems to occur in the highly political arena of securing departmental dedication. Two years ago I could not have, with good conscience, accorded it honorable mention. But, 1974 and 1975 offer a different political setting in graduate school departments. The departmental buyers are now seeing, as never before in my memory, community college preparation as profitable merchandise. Breakdown in this strategy at the critical point of departmental dedication might now be overcome.

The second grand-scale strategy consists of directly igniting Graduate School stalwarts with community college zeal, and then fanning and nurturing their flames. This strategy appeals because even two or three professors can use it, especially if one has been elected to the Graduate Assembly and has earned respect in that company. For example, one such person secured audience before her Graduate Council for a very engaging and persuasive community college president. Afterward, representatives from History, Biological Sciences, and Engineering wanted follow-through and, along with the protagonist from Education, went to talk with the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies. The Dean out-enthused them and volunteered to head a committee to look into ways and means. Final product from this beginning was a Graduate School incentive-grant arrangement to get doctoral departments into the act of preparing community college teachers, along with a Resource Committee to advise departments and a "model" program suggestion that included a community college internship. I am neither applauding nor derogating this particular product. It was a grand-scale output, however, and thus illustrates the potentials in the stalwart-ignition strategy. It should be obvious also that the strategy almost always depends for success upon the personal connections, astuteness, and persistence of the igniter and nurturer. In this case, the location of the professor of community college education in the College of Education made no difference. But, the presence of an enthusable Associate Dean of Graduate Studies might be non-replicable. That is why some of us look favorably upon a proposal that a university's Department of Higher Education should be part of the Office of the Graduate Dean.

Exposition of political reinforcements for desires to get non-

Education graduate divisions into preservice preparation of community college personnel now concludes. But, one disclaimer is necessary. The exposition, I fear, conveys a posture of reluctance and disdain as permeating university graduate divisions. That does not tally with my personal experience. What does permeate is the presence of professors with favorable postures, but baffled by or resigned to inertial momentum. Politics of protagonism seeks to countervail inertia, not iniquity. With that apologia, exposition now turns to such politics aimed at in-service products who have escalated prowess.

2. On-the-Job Staff Members

Need on the parts of community college staff members for inservice and continuing education is declared to be tremendous and critical. Actual voiced demands for these kinds of education are somewhat heavy, but not staggering. Graduate professors in Education at universities are significantly involved in responding to such demands. Occasionally, professors from other departments respond also. The total university response, however, meets not more than ten per cent of the live demand and probably not one per cent of the estimated need at present.

Obviously, the desired future role and scope of a given university's dedication to in-service and continuing education sets the definitive characteristics of protagonism on its behalf. As things now stand, the Education professors can control how much and what kind of university involvement will be viewed as desirable. If they do not promote expansion or escalation, probably no one else will. If they champion modest, or even gargantuan, expansions, the first intermediary, or start-up, roles must be theirs.

In 1974, the best opportunities for promotive intermediarism seem to lie in summer, on-campus Institutes or workshops. These afford occasion for enlisting the services of other-department university professors. Soon, the departments or divisions involved can and do stand on their own feet. Also, professorial Institute participants furnish referrals to community colleges in search of consultants or local institute directors. The department or college from which the professors were borrowed for the summer may soon help with extension-type services during the regular year; this can be accelerated by contacts between the Education professors and the proper promoter in the Division of Extension.

It is not necessary to elaborate further upon tactics of the sort indicated. Already evident is that they are time consuming and energy draining for the protagonist. These tactics also tend to break down monopolies that protagonists may treasure a great deal. For these, and many more fundamental, reasons, the Education professor may deem it unprofitable to undertake a brokerage role in this area of staff development.

The foregoing paragraphs give short shrift to tactical empowerment for aggrandizing the university graduate school's engagement with inservice education for community college personnel. That choice is deliberate on my part, mirroring priorities attached to the first and third territories of staff development as university engagements. Perhaps I should explain that I see the External Degree development as serving primarily the third territory of products--those consisting of high-level specialists. Exposition next addresses that territory.

3. "Doctoral" Specialists

Here we deal preponderantly with advanced graduate programs, almost

exclusively under Education auspices, that require Graduate School approval. Also, nearly all require inputs from departments and professors other than the sponsoring ones. In these cases, the politics of protagonism has setting and purposes considerably different from those thus far exposed.

For one difference, in these cases approval by a third party-- the Graduate School--is sought. In happy circumstances when approval criteria and program desirabilities can be made congruent, the normal amount of expediting persuasion is about all the protagonism present. But, when incongruences collide, "brokerage" is translated as selling some particulars to a person or committee. Meritoriousness of the proposal is one value to sell but arguments and arguers contribute other values. It is amazing, actually, to witness how much leeway turns up within Graduate School regulations. Two attributes of a proposed program seem to assist leeway-finding, namely, having a grant, and dealing with minorities or women. When the rules do not flex, the option of trying to change the rules is open, of course. But, chances of success from a College of Education launching pad are not great. Occasionally, enough common cause can be found between allies such as Engineering and Business to deliver the necessary votes. But, all in all, the best reliance for success in program approval brokerage is upon previously-cultivated respect on the parts of those who interpret rules.

A more important challenge to protagonists arises when program content is their concern. A Graduate School almost always has in it somewhere the exact content needed in a given program. But, it is often hard for students in Community College programs to get at that content. Obstacles can be mechanical: prerequisites for a desired course or scheduling hang-

ups, as examples. Obstacles can be professional: Unwillingness or inability to make the content come alive for students with community college ambitions while catering to other students simultaneously. Obstacles may be curricular: the content desired does exist in a department's offerings but it is scattered among a half-dozen course offerings and the program students can afford only one. Such obstacles are inevitable; some program directors/designers just give up and say "get credit for 6 hours in something." Others go after the content as protagonists. Mechanical difficulties can be overcome very often by communication at department head or dean level. Professorial and curriculum obstacles call for winning friends and influencing people, but chiefly rely upon one of two assets: (1) already-established respect and interest on the part of the professor and department concerned, or (2) a block of able students with which to arouse other-department interest. With ten to fifteen intellectually attractive students to deliver as patrons, one can negotiate successfully on a university campus for almost any program content desired, in my observation.

It seems almost inevitable, and quite wise, that many of the programs will involve External Degree features. Already referenced are the political strategems involved in getting Graduate School holy water sprinkled upon such features. Another "getting," however, is much more crucial. It is getting budgetary support for quality performance in an External mode. Here is where Deans are the chief reliance, but their roles are difficult ones. Protagonism confronts and persuades Deans with outside testimony, prestigious advocates, and sheer cajolery. Incentive grants from outside help, as do combinations of other Deans also urging external-

ism. However, as I assess the costs involved in high-quality External programs, university coffers over the next decade can never furnish the dollars required. Protagonists do well to turn to employing entities to state legislatures, and to the United States Congress for supplements. That route leads through politics of classic character. I submit that without such politics, Externalism will be greater bane than blessing.

Now to close the paper and, hopefully, launch rewarding discussion, I point out that I am bullish on the brokerage role. That is because I have seen it get some modest desired results. I have seen it fail more often, however. And, a brokerage role is going to be baffling for Education professors who are in non-graduate-school company three-fourths their time.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION